

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the restriction requirement dated July 24, 2008, the Examiner delineated six (6) distinct inventions as set forth on page 2 of the Office Action.

In response to the Restriction Requirement Applicants elect without traverse Group III, corresponding to Claim 4, drawn to a primer set consisting of SEQ ID NO:9-13.

Further Applicants reserve the right to file divisional application on the non-elected subject matter, if so desired, and be accorded the benefit of the filing date of the parent application.

Divisional applications filed thereafter should not be subject to double-patenting ground of rejection, In re Joyce (Commr. Pat. 1957) 115 USPQ 412.

Restriction is only proper if the claims of the restricted groups are independent or patentably distinct and there would be a serious burden placed on the Examiner if restriction is not required (M.P.E.P. §803).

Applicants make no statement regarding the patentable distinction of the Group, but note that for the restriction to be proper there must be patentable differences.

Applicants submit that the above-identified application is now in condition for examination on the merits and an early notice of such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.  
Norman F. Oblon

Customer Number

**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 08/07)



Paul J. Kilos  
Registration No. 58,014